•	OIPE			
	MAR 0 7 2002			
	IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT	AND TRADEMARK OFFICE		
	In re. Patent Application of:)		
	D. Rich Lang))		
-	Filed: January 31, 2001	Examiner: Willmon Fridie, Jr.		
	Serial No: 09/773,343) Group Art Unit: 3722)		
	For: AVIATION CHECKLIST AND METHOD OF ADVERTISING WHICH INCORPORATES AN AVIATION CHECKLIST	,))))		
	Atty. Ref. No.: 44PA0300	,)		
	Assistant Commissioner for Patents Box RESPONSES Group Art Unit 3722 Washington, D.C. 20231			
	Dear Sir or Madam:			
	EXPRESS MAIL CE	ERTIFICATE		
	"Express Mail" Label Number <u>FT853868608 US</u>			
	Date: March 7, 2002			
	I hereby certify that the enclosed "Applicant's Response to Office Action of December 7,			
	2001", including Amended Claims, and Return Postcard are being deposited with the United			
	States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 CFR §1.10 on			
	the date indicated above and is addressed to the Assi	stant Commissioner for Patents,		
	Washington, D.C. 20231.			
	Robert R.	Waters		
(Typed or printed name of person mailing paper or fee)				
	Del S	2. Water		
	(Signature of person mailing pa	aper or fee)		

3-18-52

3-18-52 ME5/AMOT

MAR 0 7 2002

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

HADEN	Patent Application of:		
	D. Rich Lang		
Filed	January 31, 2001	Examiner: Willmon Fridie, Jr.	
Comic	No. 00/772 242	Group Art Unit: 3722	
Seria	l No: 09/773,343))	뀨
For:	AVIATION CHECKLIST AND	HAR 3700	30
	METHOD OF ADVERTISING WHICH	MAIL 21	=
	INCORPORATES AN AVIATION CHECKLIST	2093 AIL F	田
	CHECKLIST	ROUM ROUM	
Atty.	Ref. No.: 44PA0300	艺	

Assistant Commissioner for Patents Box RESPONSES Group Art Unit 3722 Washington, D.C. 20231

Dear Sir or Madam:

APPLICANT'S RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION OF DECEMBER 7, 2001

In response to the Office Action dated December 7, 2001, the Applicant hereby provides the following Response:

1) The Examiner has rejected Claims 1 - 16 under 35 U.S.C § 112 as being indefinite as the Examiner found it to be unclear as to what the applicant is claiming as "information".

In response, the Applicant has amended Claim 1 to identify that the information is for the purposes of aiding a flight crew in conducting pre-flight, in-flight and pre-landing check steps.

In addition, the word "panels" has been changed to "messages" in Claims 7 and 8 for clarity.

2) The Examiner has rejected Claims 9 - 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being

incomplete for omitting the steps describing the assembly of the device.

In response, the Applicant has amended Claim 9 to more specifically describe the steps taken in the assembly of the aviation checkbook article. In addition, the word "panels" has been changed to "messages" in Claims 15 and 16 for clarity.

In keeping with the new procedures for amending claims in an application, we have enclosed the Amended Claims in a marked up version as well as a clean version of the Amended Claims.

Having responded appropriately and in full to the Office Action, the Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the Claims and advancement of the application to the Issue Branch.

Respectfully submitted,

ROBERT R. WATERS, #43,241

Counsel for Applicant

D. Rich Lang

WATERS LAW OFFICES, PLLC 633 SEVENTH STREET HUNTINGTON, WV 25701 (304) 522-6658